VOL. XX

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

\_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

-vs-

10-CR-219S

TONAWANDA COKE CORPORATION MARK L. KAMHOLZ,

Defendants.

-----

Proceedings held before the

Honorable William M. Skretny, U.S.

Courthouse, 2 Niagara Circle, Buffalo,

New York on March 28, 2013.

## APPEARANCES:

AARON J. MANGO, Assistant United States Attorney, ROCKY PIAGGIONE, Senior Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice, Appearing for the United States.

GREGORY F. LINSIN, ESQ.,
JEANNE M. GRASSO, ESQ.,
ARIEL S. GLASNER, ESQ.,
Appearing for Tonawanda Coke Corporation.

RODNEY PERSONIUS, ESQ., Appearing for Mark L. Kamholz.

Also Present: Lauren DiFillipo, Paralegal Sheila Henderson, Paralegal

Michelle L. McLaughlin, RPR, Official Reporter, U.S.D.C. W.D.N.Y. (716)332-3560

	Case 1:10-cr-00219-WMS-HKS	Document 335 Filed 10/10/14	Page 2 of 55
			4226
1		INDEX	
2			PAGE
3	VERDICT		4241
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 (Jury not present in the courtroom.) 2 THE CLERK: Criminal case 3 number 2010-CR-219, United States of America versus 4 Tonawanda Coke and Mark Kamholz. 5 THE COURT: Sorry for the slight delay. 6 Are there any preliminary matters? 7 The attorneys and parties are present for the 8 record. 9 MR. PERSONIUS: No, your Honor. 10 MR. MANGO: No, your Honor. 11 MR. LINSIN: None on behalf of Tonawanda, 12 your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. We have a new attorney with us, Mr. Glasner, from what I 14 15 understand. He's here. Okay. 16 Chris, if the jury's here we'll have them 17 brought in, please. COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Sure. 18 19 (Jury seated.) 20 THE COURT: Good morning. 21 THE JURY: Good morning. THE COURT: Please have a seat. Okay. 22 23 you can see, ladies and gentlemen, and on our 24 behalf, we're glad to see you here this morning. 25 The attorneys and parties are present. And the day

has come, okay. We're going to ask you now -- and everything is ready to get you started to -- you can take your notebooks in, if you choose to do that, to the jury deliberation room. But, you know, use it appropriately from the standpoint of if there are differing entries that some of you may have made, talk it out, work it out. What's not evidence in terms of the summations, if any of you jotted some notes, and I saw a few of you take notes, make sure you consider that as nonevidence, but as a guide to maybe the direction that you think the deliberations should go.

I know you take this case seriously. And, you know, your duty now is very serious. You get to decide this case now. And you have to do it according to the law and following the instructions that I gave you the last couple of days.

Your verdict must be unanimous. You must consider each count separately and as to each defendant separately, understanding that the defendants are cloaked with the presumption of innocence, which never leaves until and if you find that one or more of the defendants on any one or more of the counts has been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

It's a task that you've worked very hard to get to this point. And I know you've heard me mention many times, it's going to take the application of your common sense, your experience, your intelligence to developing a methodology to get into the indictment, get it resolved in light of those fact issues that only you can decide, because you now become the judges of the facts.

I think you know how the rules should work, and that from here on out the communications, if there are any, should be in writing between your foreperson and me, and then if necessary, I join the attorneys and parties into the discussion before I respond, or until we bring you out here for further discussions.

Do your best to work through everything. And it takes respect for each other's points of views. And you've come to know each other, I think, pretty well over the course of the 30-plus days that all of us have been together. And that's a good thing, because when you spend that much time together, and when you've been as apparently committed as you have been to this particular case, it should allow you to do what everybody selected you to do, and that is to return a unanimous verdict in this case.

Because, again, as you've heard me say, nobody knows more about this case than all of you.

So, we're about ready to send you out. It will take just a few moments to wheel in the cart and bring in a couple of exhibits following that into your jury deliberation room. That will be done while you're there.

We have to swear Chris in, the court security officer, by separate oath. We will do that now, and then he will be responsible for you in a different capacity during your deliberations.

We also bid farewell to our two alternates,

Mr. Carlson and Mr. Demmer, and we thank you for

your service. You know, I know it's a lot of time

to invest and not get to deliberate. But, frankly,

you played a critical role. We appreciate that.

We thank you very much for that. We ask you please

to maintain the confidentiality, the silence, all

of that not only in respect for the system, but for

your fellow jurors. And I wish I could have let

you, if you had the opportunity to, to sleep in

today, but we'd never know. So we did need you to

come here. Frankly, we're very grateful that you

invested the time and the effort that you did.

Thank you very much. And we have to have you leave

now. And if you'd leave your notebooks behind, we will collect those as well. Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate it.

(Alternate jurors excused.)

THE COURT: I didn't tell Chris he could go, but I hope he comes back. Maybe he doesn't want to get sworn in, I don't know.

You had us worried there for a minute, Chris. We didn't know if you were coming back.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: I didn't know if I was part of their crew.

THE COURT: Colleen, if you could administer the oath, please.

(Court security officer oath administered.)

THE COURT: Okay. If you listen to the oath, it's somewhat harsh. It kind of ensures that you're going to get some work done without meat or drink, but we will make exceptions for that.

We are going to have some lunch brought in for you today as well. Okay. And, you know, you're free to eat it or not. And it's sort of an incentive to keep you fortified so we can get you through this process, and, you know, it's -- it's kind of our thanks for, you know, what you are

doing. And hopefully it will enable you, with maybe your own lunch or whatever, to work through the process as efficiently as you can, keeping in mind what we've said so many times that this is a very important case to both sides. Okay.

Are you ready? Okay. It's all up to you. You are the judges of the facts. Please start your deliberations, and go forward, and then we'll wait to hear from you when you tell us you have your unanimous verdict. Okay. Thank you very much very much, folks.

(Jury excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. If you will keep

Colleen posted in terms of your contact numbers,

where you are. Please make every effort, once we

do contact you, to get back here as expeditiously
as possible.

MR. LINSIN: Your Honor, could I just make one inquiry?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LINSIN: With respect to the alternates, and obviously I'm hopeful this circumstance doesn't arise. But in the event of the disability of one of the 12 sitting jurors, I presume the Court has methods of contacting the

alternates to bring them back in?

THE COURT: Yes, we do.

MR. LINSIN: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Frankly, I don't think it's right to keep them here, but we can track them down with their locater information.

MR. LINSIN: All right. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. LINSIN: I guess the only other just practical question, your Honor, is how long — has the Court made a judgment on how long you would have the jury deliberate if we do not wind up with a verdict before the end of the day? Do we have a time period in mind when we should plan to be back here in the event we have not received the phone call, I guess that's the easiest way to put it.

THE COURT: Well, I would want you here, in the event that nothing happens all day, to be back here before 5:00 o'clock.

MR. LINSIN: All right.

THE COURT: And what I would then do is I would discuss with you what your thoughts are about continuing the deliberations. I also would like to get a feel from the jury. Sometimes they will

1 communicate that in terms of whether they're ready 2 to hang it up for the day and move forward, or if 3 they'd like to stay. And I'll try to accommodate whatever I sense is their preference, if that's 4 5 okay with you. But I'll discuss it with you first. 6 MR. LINSIN: All right. Thank you, your 7 Honor. 8 THE COURT: Great. Okay. 9 MR. LINSIN: Oh, can we get a copy of the 10 final charge? There were a couple of modifications 11 that were discussed. A copy of the charge that's 12 actually going back to the jury. 13 THE COURT: Yes. It will take a little 14 bit. 15 MR. LINSIN: Maybe later -- whenever we 16 come back later in the day, that would be fine. 17 THE COURT: Yeah, we can have it ready for 18 What do you think? 19 LAW CLERK: Whenever. 20 THE COURT: Half an hour? 21 MR. LINSIN: Sure. 22 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 23 MR. LINSIN: Thank you, your Honor. 24 (Short recess was taken.) 25 (Jury not present in the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Colleen, if you would call the case, please.

THE CLERK: Criminal case number 2010-CR-219, United States versus Tonawanda Coke and Mark Kamholz.

THE COURT: And the attorneys and parties are back present. May I have the note, please?

Okay. For your information, I received a note about 12:51. Then I set Colleen to contacting everybody. And I thought I'd read the note to you. And you should have been distributed a copy of 6 NYCRR 214.10. The note is from and signed by the person that I believe is the foreperson, that's juror number 9, and that's Dennis McDonell. Okay.

The note reads as follows: Dated today. The note's timed at 12:50. And the note reads: "Can we see T-6 NYCRR 214.10(a) and NYCRR 10(b)." And then in paren, "Or if we have them, where are they", question mark, close paren. My favorite part of the note, for whatever that's worth.

MR. LINSIN: Could I ask you to reread the numbers?

THE COURT: Yes, it's Title 6 I think what's 214.10(a), and 214.10(b). I guess -- I'm assuming it's 214.10 and then sub A and 214.10 sub

B. And that's what I distributed to you. And I'd like to get your views on what you suggest that I do in response.

I'll tell you what I think, and then you tell me what you think. And I don't view this as problematic, responding to this request. I could read both subsections of Title 10 -- or of Title 6 that are requested. But it would seem to me if I do that, they should, in any event get this title and the sections. So I don't know how you want to proceed. I'll listen to what anybody else has to say. If you want me to read it, I will and then give them a copy, or just send in a copy with a note saying this is pursuant to your request. Thank you.

MR. MANGO: We're good with if you want to send in the copy, your Honor, or however you want to proceed.

MR. LINSIN: We agree. That seems like it would be the most efficient, and just -- with just that indication, and they can take as a, you know, a supplemental provision to the Court's legal instructions. You know, something like that.

THE COURT: I think what I'll say though is I've consulted with the attorneys, and as you

1 requested, I am enclosing the Title 6 provision. 2 Okay. Does that work for everybody? 3 MR. PERSONIUS: It does for us, your 4 Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. I'll do that forthwith. 6 I'll get it in to the jury, and then we'll keep you 7 posed as things go forward. All right. 8 MR. LINSIN: Thank you, your Honor. 9 MR. MANGO: Thank you, your Honor. 10 MR. PERSONIUS: Thank you very much. 11 (Short recess was taken.) 12 (Jury not present in the courtroom.) 13 THE COURT: Colleen, if you call the case, 14 please. 15 THE CLERK: Criminal case 2010-CR-219, 16 United States versus Tonawanda Coke and Mark 17 Kamholz. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon. 19 record will reflect that the attorneys and parties 20 are back present. I did receive a note from the 21 jury, and virtually immediately after receipt I did 22 contact everybody. The time was 3:25 p.m. And 23 this is our first opportunity to assemble after 24 notification by note. The note is timed.

dated today -- but it's timed 3:20. So it took a

25

little time to get it in the envelope and get it walked over to chambers.

It's not entirely clear to me what the jury is saying. I believe we have a verdict. That's my assessment. But, the note reads as follows. "We are done." All right. Unsigned. Okay. So, you know, I think that that means that they have a verdict.

My suggestion is that we do this, that we bring the entire jury in, and I think, one, if the foreman is carrying what looks like the verdict form, it's probably an indication that the jury has a verdict. But in any event, I will ask him if he would tell me whether or not the note, which I will read back to him, means that in speaking for the jury he, the foreperson, has a unanimous verdict to return to the court. And if he says yes, then we go forward.

The way I would like to go forward, and what is my standard procedure, especially in lengthier indictments, I would like to explain to the jury that I will take the verdict form, and -- I will have Colleen take it and bring it up here in the presence of the jury. What I would like to do is review it, and then advise everybody if it is in

conformity both as to substance and in form.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to do it at my conference room just outside the courtroom and send the jury back. I don't like to do it in front of the jury, necessarily. It, I don't think, will take a long time. But I just want to track everything, make sure it's signed, make sure the sequence is correct. If there's an issue in my view with either form or substance, I can then notify all of you, we can discuss it, and then I can bring the jury back, and then address it that way. I think that's the safest way that I know of proceeding. And, you know, I'm not going anywhere. I'm just going to take a look at it and immediately come back out and that's the way I suggest to you that we proceed.

From the government's standpoint, Mr. Mango, does that work?

MR. MANGO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense standpoint, Mr. Linsin?

MR. LINSIN: That is fine with us, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Personius?

MR. PERSONIUS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Once I'm done and the jury verdict -- well the jury form will be returned to the foreperson, the foreman of the jury, and then Colleen will read each count individually starting with 1 through 20 and ask for the verdict to be entered, or at least answered to her inquiry for purposes of the record, and then we'll enter it afterwards if that's acceptable to everybody as well. Mr. Mango?

MR. MANGO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Linsin?

MR. LINSIN: That's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. Personius?

MR. PERSONIUS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. We need to notify Chris to bring the jury in, please.

Okay. I may have said 1 through -- 1 through 20. Did I say that? I meant to say 1 through 19.

I will exit with Mr. Moeller too, by the way, if it's okay with everybody, and that will assist me in terms of working through everything. And he stands bodyguard outside the conference room door as well.

(Jury seated.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and

gentlemen. Please have a seat. Okay. As all of you know, we are reassembled in the case of United States versus Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark Kamholz, defendants. I do have your most recent note which was recorded I think on your correspondence to me at 3:20 p.m. this afternoon.

Mr. McDonell, I believe you are the foreman of the jury?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Would you mind standing, please, just so everybody can clearly hear you. The note is not totally clear. All right. The note reads: "We are done." And, you know, that can probably be interpreted a number of ways. But, I guess from our standpoint, are you reporting that you are authorized on behalf of all of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury to return a unanimous verdict for the Court's consideration?

THE FOREMAN: On all counts, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. What I'd like to do -and thank you for that clarification. My practice
is to have you give your original verdict form to
my courtroom deputy, Colleen Demma. She'll take it
from you. What I will do then is accept it, and I
will send you back to the deliberation room. But I

will take it and I will review it to make sure that it's, at least to my review, consistent in form and in substance. And then if there are any issues, I have an opportunity to discuss it with the lawyers, and then I'll bring you back.

If there are no issues, I simply bring you back, and then I will have the verdict form returned to you, Mr. McDonnell. And we will take the verdict, and on your authorization that you speak for the jury, we will go through each count individually and separately. It will be read to you by Miss Demma, and then you respond as the foreman of the jury for each count. And then we'll proceed from Count 1 through 19 in that fashion.

If everything is in order when that's complete, then the verdict, as a unanimous verdict, will be entered into the record. Is that understood by you?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I guess the first step in that process, Miss Demma, if you would get the folder that contains I think the verdict form.

And the record will reflect that I received in the manila folder the verdict form in this case.

I am going to ask you now, ladies and

gentlemen, before I go to my conference room to review it, for you to go to the deliberation room and just wait. It should just be a matter of minutes, unless there is an issue I have to discuss with the lawyers. Okay. Thank you very much.

(Jury excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. You may have a seat I'll be right back.

(The Judge left the bench.)

(Jury not present in the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. The attorneys and parties are back present. I've completed the review of the verdict form, and I find that it appears to be in order both as to form and substance. Given that, I will ask Colleen to notify the security officer to return the jury to the courtroom, and then I will give you, Colleen, the verdict form to return to Mr. McDonell. Okay?

THE CLERK: Okay.

(Jury seated.)

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, I have completed the review of the verdict form. I advised the attorneys that I have found it to appear to be in order as far as form and substance is concerned.

I'm going to return the verdict form in its folder to Miss Demma. She will return it to Mr. McDonell.

And if you wouldn't mind standing,

Mr. McDonell, we would appreciate it.

And once again, Mr. McDonell, the verdict that you are about to return you are authorized to do so by the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is that correct?

THE FOREMAN: Correct, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE CLERK: On Count 1, violation of the Clean Air Act, pressure relief valve, 2005.

From on or about July 29, 2005, to on or about December 31st, 2005, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by emitting coke oven gas from the pressure relief valve in the by-products department, an unpermitted emission source, condition 4 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United

States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 1 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 1 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 2, violation of the Clean Air Act, pressure relief valve, 2006.

From on or about January 1, 2006, to on or about December 31, 2006, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke
Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by emitting coke oven gas from a pressure relief valve in the by-products department, an unpermitted emission source, condition 4 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 2 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 2 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 3, violation of the Clean Air Act, pressure relief valve, 2007.

From on or about January 1st, 2007, to on or about December 31st, 2007, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by emitting coke oven gas from a pressure relief valve in the by-products department, an unpermitted emission source, condition 4 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 3 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 3 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 4, violation of the Clean Air Act, pressure relief valve, 2008.

From on or about January 1st, 2008, to on or about December 31st, 2008, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by emitting coke oven gas from a pressure relief valve in the by-products department, an unpermitted emission source, condition 4 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States

Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United

States Code, Section 2. How do you find on Count 4

as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 4 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 5, violation of the Clean Air Act, pressure relief valve, 2009.

From on or about January 1st, 2009, to on or

about December 31st, 2009, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by emitting coke oven gas from a pressure relief valve in the by-products department, an unpermitted emission source, condition 4 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 5 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 5 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 6, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 1 west, 2005.

From on or about July 29th, 2005, to on or about December 31st, 2005, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke

Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the western quench tower, quench tower number 1, at the coke corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 96 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 6 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 6 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 7, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 1 west, 2006.

From on or about January 1st, 2006, to on or about December 31st, 2006, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary

source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the western quench tower, quench tower number 1, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 96 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 7 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Not quilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 7 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 8, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 1 west, 2007.

From on or about January 1st, 2007, to on or about December 31st, 2007, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in

violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the western quench tower, quench tower number 1, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 96 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 8 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 8 as to defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Not quilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 9, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 1 west, 2008.

From on or about January 1st, 2008, to on or about December 31st, 2008, in the Western District of New York, the defendants Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation in violation of its Title V permit requirements by

operating the western quench tower, quench tower number 1, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 96 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 9 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 9 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 10, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 1 west, 2009.

From on or about January 1st, 2009, to on or about December 31st, 2009, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the western quench tower, quench tower

number 1, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 96 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 10 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 10 as to defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Not quilty.

THE CLERK: On Count 11, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 2 east, 2005.

From on or about July 29, 2005, to on or about December 31st, 2005, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the eastern quench tower, quench tower number 2, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system

installed in such quench tower, condition 97 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States

Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18 United States

Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 11 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 11 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 12, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 2 east, 2006.

From on or about January 1st, 2006, to on or about December 31st, 2006, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the eastern quench tower, quench tower number 2, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 97 of the Tonawanda Coke

Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 12 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 12 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 13, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 2 east, 2007.

From on or about January 1st, 2007 to on or about December 31st, 2007, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating an eastern quench tower, quench tower number 2, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 90 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 13 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 13 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 14, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 2 east, 2008.

From on or about January 1st, 2008, to on or about December 31st, 2008, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the eastern quench tower, quench tower number 2, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 97 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States

Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 14 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 14 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 15, violation of the Clean Air Act, baffle system, quench tower 2 east, 2009.

From on or about January 1st, 2009, to on or about November 15th, 2009, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly operate and cause to be operated a stationary source, to wit, the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, in violation of its Title V permit requirements by operating the eastern quench tower, quench tower number 2, at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation without a baffle system installed in such quench tower, condition 97 of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V permit.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 7413(c)(1) and Title 18, United

States Code, Section 2.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

How do you find on Count 15 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 15 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 16, obstruction of justice, 2009.

From on or about April 14th, 2009, to on or about April 21st, 2009, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did corruptly influence, obstruct, and impede and endeavor to influence, obstruct, and impede the due and proper administration of the law under which a pending proceeding was being had before the United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, an agency of the United States government, by instructing a Tonawanda Coke Corporation employee to conceal, during an EPA inspection, the fact that a pressure relief valve in the by-products department, during normal operations, emitted coke oven gas to the atmosphere, in violation of the Tonawanda Coke Corporation's Title V operating permit.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1505 and 2.

How do you find on Count 16 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Not guilty.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 16 as to the defendant Mark L. Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: Count 17, violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, storage of toxic waste on the ground adjacent to Barrett tanks, 1998 to 2009.

From at least in or about May of 1998 to on or about December 17th, 2009, the exact dates unknown, in the Western District of New York the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly store and cause to be stored on the ground adjacent to two large deteriorating tanks at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, a waste exhibiting the toxicity characteristic for benzene, a hazardous waste identified under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA, without a permit to store such hazardous waste as required under RCRA.

All in violation of Title 42, United States

Code, Section 6928(d)(2)(A) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

Count 17 continued. Part A, defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation.

How do you find Count 17 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 17, do you find that the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about May 31st, 1998, to on or about December 17th, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 17 as to the defendant Mark Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 17, do you find that defendant Mark Kamholz violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about May 31st, 1998, to on or about December 7, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: Count 18, violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, disposal of toxic waste from in and around the Barret

tanks, 2009.

From in or about June of 2009 to on or about September 17th, 2009, the exact dates unknown, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly dispose and cause to be disposed a waste exhibiting the toxicity characteristic for benzene, a hazardous waste identified under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA, originating from in and around the two large deteriorating tanks at the Tonawanda Coke Corporation, without a permit to dispose of such hazardous waste as required under RCRA.

All in violation of Title 42, United States Code, Section 6928(d)(2)(A) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 18 as to defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 18, do you find that the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about June 30th, 2009, to on or about September 17th, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 18 as to defendant Mark Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 18, do you find that the defendant Mark Kamholz violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about June 30th, 2009, to on or about September 7, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: Count 19, violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, disposal of decanter tank tar sludge K087, 2005 to 2009.

From on or about August 2nd, 2005, to on or about December 17, 2009, in the Western District of New York, the defendants, Tonawanda Coke
Corporation and Mark L. Kamholz, did knowingly dispose and cause to be disposed decanter tank tar sludge from coking operations, K087, a hazardous waste identified and listed under the Resource
Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA, originating from the by-products department at the Tonawanda
Coke Corporation and spread on to the coalfield without a permit to dispose of such hazardous waste as required under RCRA.

All in violation of Title 42, United States

Code, Section 6928(d)(2)(A) and Title 18 United States Code, Section 2.

How do you find on Count 19 as to the defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 19, do you find that defendant Tonawanda Coke Corporation violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about August 2nd, 2005, to on or about December 7th, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: How do you find on Count 19 as to defendant Mark Kamholz?

THE FOREMAN: Guilty.

THE CLERK: As to Count 19, do you find that defendant Mark Kamholz violated the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act every day from on or about August 2nd, 2005 to on or about December 17th, 2009?

THE FOREMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, Colleen.

Mr. McDonell, on behalf of all of the ladies and gentlemen of the jury as the foreperson -- or the foreman of this jury, is that the entire verdict that you were authorized unanimously to return as

1 to each defendant on each count of this indictment? 2 THE FOREMAN: Yes, it is. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much for 4 your service as foreman. We'd like to take the 5 verdict form and the folder. We'll take that. You 6 may have a seat once you give that to Miss Demma. 7 And as to the attorneys for defendant Tonawanda 8 Coke, is there anything additional, Mr. Linsin? 9 MR. LINSIN: Your Honor, I would request 10 that the jury be polled. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Personius, on 12 behalf of defendant, Mark Kamholz, is there any 13 request? 14 MR. PERSONIUS: We join in that request, 15 your Honor. THE COURT: From the government's 16 17 standpoint, Mr. Mango? MR. MANGO: No request, your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. 20 Ladies and gentlemen, each of you will be asked by 21 Miss Demma, in summary terms by me, whether in fact 22 the verdict rendered as announced by your foreman, 23 Mr. McDonell, is in point of fact your verdict.

THE CLERK: Juror number 1, Mrs. Lambert,

Miss Demma, if you would poll the jury, please.

24

25

1 does your verdict as published constitute your 2 individual verdict in all respects? 3 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 4 THE CLERK: Juror number 2, Mr. Wilson, 5 does your verdict as published constitute your 6 individual in all respects? 7 A JUROR: Yes. 8 THE CLERK: Juror number 3, Mr. Collins, 9 does your verdict as published constitute your 10 individual verdict in all respects? 11 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 12 THE CLERK: Juror number 4, Mrs. Andolina, 13 does your verdict as published constitute your 14 individual verdict in all respects? 15 A JUROR: Yes. 16 THE CLERK: Juror number 5, 17 Mrs. Funderburk, does your verdict as published constitute your individual verdict in all respects? 18 19 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 20 THE CLERK: Juror number 6, 21 Miss Majerowski, does your verdict as published 22 constitute your individual verdict in all respects? 23 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 24 Juror number 7, Mr. Bauman, THE CLERK:

does your verdict as published constitute your

25

1 individual verdict in all respects? 2 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 3 THE CLERK: Juror number 8, 4 Mrs. Palistrant, does your verdict as published 5 constitute your individual varied in all respects? 6 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 7 THE CLERK: Juror number 9, Mr. McDonell, 8 does your verdict as published constitute your 9 individual verdict in all respects? 10 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 11 THE CLERK: Juror number 10, Miss Russ, 12 does your verdict as published constitute your 13 individual verdict in all respects? 14 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 15 THE CLERK: Juror number 11, Ms. Malyszka, 16 does your verdict as published constitute your 17 individual verdict in all the respects? 18 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 19 THE CLERK: Juror number 12, 20 Mrs. Stelianou, does your verdict as published 21 constitute your individual verdict in all respects? 22 A JUROR: Yes, it does. 23 THE COURT: Okay. The verdict as 24 returned, as published, and as affirmed will be now 25 entered as part of the court record.

Ladies and gentlemen, you've been here a long time, and I'm about to discharge you from jury service. By a long time, more than a month is a long time, as you know, right? And what I'm going to ask you to do is this. I know you've put up with me for a long time, but I'd ask you to stay, if you have the time, for just a few minutes afterwards so that I can speak with you in the jury deliberation room. If you cannot stay and you have to leave, I want to thank those of you that leave and let you know on behalf of all of us that we appreciate your service.

The duration of the time you spent really doesn't necessarily speak for what we called upon you to do in this particular case. And I suspect that you probably didn't know what it was going to be like to serve as jurors for this period of time in this kind of a case when you started out.

And, you know, I watched you every day, and you know that, and we worked together every day, and that's all we can really expect is that you appear to make every single best effort that you can to stay engaged. And this case in many respects by way of subject matter is a very complicated case, because it involves terminology most of you and

most of us are not familiar with.

And I think there's a lesson in this for all of us, and maybe more graphically to you than anybody else, and I hope that you understand how significant the system of justice is in this country and what it means to be a — to have a system that lends itself to ensuring that there's a fair administration of justice. That can't be done without the kind of participation that you appeared to devote to this particular case.

And there were days when things were tedious, and maybe more than a few days, but I don't think that ever I saw any of you really tune out. You really seemed to make an effort to stay engaged, and I think that's a real compliment and tribute to you.

I do want to talk with you, because I think I can learn a lot from you, and that's why I ask you to stay around. But I want you to view the service that you rendered in a way that maybe you wouldn't have thought about from the outset. Your service significantly, not just because of the duration, but what we asked you to do was to ensure that both sides received fair treatment in this case in a very serious case. And I think you'd be hard

pressed to disagree with me when I said -- or even think to say that this case wasn't important to both sides. We've talked about that a lot of times. And we talked about your application of common sense and experience and intelligence to resolving the fact issues in this case, and you became as you know, the judges of the facts.

But our system of justice is critical. I mean, our country has its shortcomings. Our country is challenged day in and day out. But if you don't have the opportunity to have jurors that are willing to make the contributions that you made over the course of this more than a month to see to it that justice was served, we have a real problem in this country. And I think you've really made a significant, a significant contribution for which all of us are very indebted to you for making that effort.

I want to also thank your foreman,

Mr. McDonell. I don't know if he was elected to

the position or received it by default, which

sometimes happens. But it's a serious undertaking,

and, I mean, obviously I don't know what took place

in your deliberations, because I think the

significance of the deliberations is kept

confidential, because you know how you have to proceed to get a matter resolved by unanimous verdict. Under any stretch in any case that's —it just can't be easy, and it does take the guidance of somebody that's committed. We thank you, Mr. McDonnell, for serving in that capacity.

We thank you on behalf, ladies and gentlemen, of my staff and the attorneys and the parties and if you allow me in particular, me personally, for your service as jurors in this case.

So, keep in mind that there's an integrity to the process and to the verdict. And the law in our circuit is you don't have to speak to anybody about this case. And if you are questioned about it, you know, I ask you if by chance you're even tempted to answer any questions, and really the lawyers and everybody else knows the limits of what they can ask you. I don't think you will be asked by anybody, but if you choose to answer any questions, you cannot discuss your deliberations.

As far as any other questions or answers, please remember if you answer in any respect, it's a reflection on all of you. I mean, you, I think, bonded as a group. And that requires respect, and also what you do also has a bearing on future

juries, because they will be asked to come into a case, maybe as reluctantly as you did from the outset, and they will be called upon to do the kind of significant service that you've been asked to perform and did. So please keep all of that in mind.

And certainly we, again, appreciate your efforts, your commitment. You know, it's amazing from my standpoint to have been on the bench for as long as I have and continue to encounter juries that make the commitment to see to it that our country gets a little bit better through the execution of the administration of justice in our third branch of the government.

Thank you all very, very much. You are now discharged as a jury. Chris will take you out for the last time. And those of you that can wait for a few minutes, I just have to tidy up a few things with the attorneys, and then after that if you choose to stay around, you'll be free to go. Thank you very much.

(Jury excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Okay. Please have a seat.

Okay. The verdict has been entered, the jury was polled.

Are there any other matters that we have to address from the standpoint of the defense,

Mr. Linsin?

MR. LINSIN: Just consideration of dates, your Honor, that's all I would --

THE COURT: I am sorry, say that again.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ LINSIN:}$$  Consideration of dates as to sentencing and where we proceed from here. That is the only issue that I see.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Personius, anything?

MR. PERSONIUS: Your Honor, I expect we will file a Rule 29 motion, and so a date for that, please. And then if you're going to set the sentencing date now, of course, that. But I think the Rule 29 is the next --

THE COURT: There's very strict

requirements on the filing of the motion, and I'll

ask you to be -- I mean goes without saying, that

you have to make certain that the time limits are

not violated as far as the motions are concerned.

And intent to file the motions does not in any way

affect the time periods for those motions. So,

keep that in mind. Do you have dates, Colleen?

Well, the Rule 29 will be first. There's

nobody here from probation, right, so I don't have any guidance for that. Set out sentencing for 120 days.

THE CLERK: Monday July 29th at 9:00 a.m.

THE COURT: Okay. That will be the date for sentencing. I think you'll get our sentencing order, which will contain some specific information that you can take into account with respect to the filing -- or the preparation for sentencing purposes. It will be contained in the order.

MR. PERSONIUS: Your Honor, forgive me for interrupting. I know I'm going to be out of town for four days, and it's right at the end of July.

I didn't bring my calendar. I apologize for not bringing it.

THE COURT: Let me set -- go ahead.

MR. PERSONIUS: All I was going to ask, is there a possibility it could be later that week?

THE COURT: Sure.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ PERSONIUS:}$$  The 1st -- or I know by the 1st I'm back. I'm just not sure.

THE COURT: I want to give you date. If you put it over to the next --

MR. MANGO: Your Honor, actually, I'm sorry. My wife is actually expecting, so it's

right around that date. If we go a little later, that may cause an issue. I don't know if maybe earlier, the middle of July would work. That wouldn't be exactly 120 days, but I think I should be okay in middle -- middle July.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what I want to do. I can't tell you that the sentencing will actually take place on that date. I'm going to try to make it as firm as we can. We can set it in mid July.

MR. MANGO: Thank you.

THE COURT: We will shoot for that date.

Does that work from defendant Tonawanda Coke?

MR. LINSIN: Well, we will attempt to make it work, your Honor, yes.

MR. PERSONIUS: Your Honor, I have a matter scheduled with you, U.S. versus Taher, that is scheduled to start in mid June, and we expect will go for three or four weeks. That would be —this is obviously going to be a significant sentencing, and that would be a hardship for me to run that trial and have to be doing a sentencing.

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to, I'm going to keep it at the middle of July. I understand that you're focusing me on potential

conflicts. But that date I think I need in order to get probation started, because it has a wealth of work to do. And then I will work with them to see where they are in the process of getting the information that's required for sentencing. And then I will reconvene everybody and we'll work through the final dates. But I need a date today just to get everything triggered and get everything ready.

For purposes of the Rule 29 motion, there's 14 days for that under the rule, as you know. So, I will leave that stand. And if there is to be a change in that, it has to be done by written motion. And then that may then affect the flexibility that we have with respect to that time period as I understand it. Okay. That would be the written motion requirement, okay, to satisfy the requirements of the 14-day period for purposes of Rule 29(c)(1).

Okay. So we're going to set at this point a 14-day period for the filing of your Rule 29 motion.

THE CLERK: April 11th.

THE COURT: April 11th. Once I get the motion, or motions however it plays out, then I'll

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

issue a text order setting the schedule, depending on the request of the defendants for time, and then the government's time to respond, and then we'll have a reply period as well. But I won't set that now until I find out what your respective motions are under Rule 29.

MR. LINSIN: All right.

THE CLERK: For the sentencing date --

THE COURT: You've got it. Those are the two dates I need. You gave me the date 14 days out, right?

THE CLERK: The sentencing date we had set July 29th. But you want a mid July date?

THE COURT: A mid July date, yes.

THE CLERK: July 15th.

THE COURT: July 15th, yes.

MR. MANGO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At 9:00 a.m.

MR. MANGO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think that wraps everything up from my standpoint. don't know of anything else, but if there is I'll entertain it now. Mr. Mango?

MR. MANGO: No, your Honor. I'd ask that Defendant Kamholz remain on the same conditions

pending sentencing.

THE COURT: Yes. I will permit that. I take it there's no objection?

MR. PERSONIUS: No. Thank you, Mr. Mango. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. That brings this case -- this trial to a conclusion. There's corresponding things that I can say that I'm not going to really get into in an elaboration. I mean you heard what I mentioned to the jury, and I think their participation is very significant. And I think all I want to say really to counsel is that I want to thank you for your professionalism, your cooperation, the dedication that you exhibited as far as your respective clients were concerned.

The system works at its very best when the lawyers are the best and where they project into their professional obligations their very best efforts. My observation is that that was done here. And frankly, you made my job as easy as one could expect it to be in a case like this because of your professionalism, your cooperation, your assistance, your enlightened discussions, everything that we worked through in this particular case. I'm not commenting on the result

at all. Please don't read anything into my comments. But I think you deserve, from my standpoint, a professional thank you for your cooperation and assistance that made the system serve as best as I think I know that it can serve.

And with that, you know, I expect you to make all your deadlines. We'll work with you to make sure that every effort is made to make sure that the final outcome in this case is the proper final outcome. Thank you very much.

MR. LINSIN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. PERSONIUS: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MANGO: Thank you, your Honor.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a Correct transcription of the proceedings Recorded by me in this matter. s/Michelle L. McLaughlin Michelle L. McLaughlin, RPR Official Reporter U.S.D.C., W.D.N.Y.